

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/625,848	07/24/2003	Dan Burris	005127.00309	8940
22909 75	90 04/29/2005		EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.			PATTERSON, MARIE D	
1001 G STREE	T, N.W. N, DC 20001-4597		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	, 20 20001 1051		3728	
			DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		ϵ	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/625,848	BURRIS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marie Patterson	3728	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. t 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thiod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rly (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communicati BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	0 March 2005.		
	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		ters, prosecution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.l). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-26 and 35-40 is 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14,27-34 and 41-48 is/are reject 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	s/are withdrawn from consided	eration.	
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ a	accepted or b) Objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	·	• • •	(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in a priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	∧ □	O	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/29/05&4/5/05.	_	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/625,848 Page 2

Art Unit: 3728

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 15-26 and 35-40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 12/22/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11-14, 27, 29-32, 41, and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Romanato (5647150).

Romanato shows a shoe with an upper (3) an air permeable substrate (8 and/or 4), and web layer (11 and/or 3) as claimed.

In reference to claims 11-13, 31, 32, and 46-48, a comparison of the recited process with the prior art processes does NOT serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product. In re Fessman, 489 F2d 742, 180 U.S.P.Q. 324 (CCPA 1974). Whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made is patentable. In re Klug, 333 F2d 905, 142 U.S.P.Q. 161 (CCPA 1964). In an ex parte case, product-by-process claims are not construed as being limited to the product formed by the

Application/Control Number: 10/625,848

Art Unit: 3728

specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15, see footnote 3 (CCPA 1976).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all 4. obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 4, 28, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable 5. over Romanato in view of Shiomura (4785558) or Bartels (4232458).

Romanato shows a shoe substantially as claimed except for the exact substrate. Shiomura or Bartels teaches the use of a substrate which comprises two layers which are interconnected by fibers as a material for uppers of footwear. It would have been obvious to use a layered substrate as taught by either Shiomura or Bartels for the substrate in the shoe of Romanato to increase fit and comfort.

Claims 8-10, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being 6. unpatentable over Romanato in view of Sass (3650051).

Romanato shows a shoe substantially as claimed except for ridges. Sass teaches providing ridges (26) on a lateral portion of a shoe. It would have been obvious to provide ridges as taught by Sass on the lateral portion of an upper in the shoe of Romanato to allow the shoe to be used for kicking a ball and to control the ball.

In reference to claim 9, since the ridges are on the web material they would inherently be located between the apertures as claimed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/30/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants' arguments directed towards Romanato, Romanato clearly states that the sock (4) could be a variety of materials including textiles and woven and non-woven materials (note column 2 lines 33-50 and column 3 lines 21-41) and states that the embodiment/species shown in figure 6 comprising element 8 is merely one embodiment/composition for the sock fabric. Romanato also states that the thermoplastic (a polymeric material) material is molded onto and integrally connected to the sock layer and leaves openings (6) allowing the sock layer to be exposed (see column 2 lines 58 - column 3 line20).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/625,848

Art Unit: 3728

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

1. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Other useful information can be obtained at the PTO Home Page at www.uspto.gov.

In order to avoid potential delays, Technology Center 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Center at <u>(703) 872-9306</u> (FORMAL FAXES ONLY). Please identify Examiner <u>Marie Patterson</u> of Art Unit <u>3728</u> at the top of your cover sheet.

Any inquiry concerning the MERITS of this examination from the examiner should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4559. The examiner can normally be reached from 6AM - 4PM Mon-Wed.

Marie Patterson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3728